

U.S. Department of State

Overseas Buildings Operations (OBO)

Industry Advisory Panel (IAP)

MINUTES OF THE FIRST MEETING: FEBRUARY 21, 2002

PURPOSE: The purpose of the meeting was to discuss a variety of issues and questions concerning OBO's mission.

LOCATION: The meeting was held in conference room 1005 at the U.S. Department of State, 2201 C Street NW, Washington, D.C. It was announced in the Federal Register for February 4, 2002 (Vol. 67, No. 23, p. 5139). A copy of the announcement is included as Attachment A.

PARTICIPANTS: IAP members, OBO staff, other Department of State staff, AFGE and OIG representatives, and three public participants. The complete list is included as Attachment B.

SUMMARY: General Charles Williams, OBO Director and Chief Operating Officer, opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. After opening remarks and administrative details, meeting attendees were asked to introduce themselves. General Williams then explained that the meeting would center on a series of topics and questions from OBO staff and initiated the discussions.

TOPIC 1:

OBO has adopted Uniformat II (ASTM Standard E-1557) as the standard for estimating in accordance with recommendations from the Design/Build Institute of America. All Independent Government Estimates are now prepared in this format, and OBO has developed a computerized cost model using this system.

What suggestions does the Panel have for encouraging or requiring contractors to provide cost back-up for their price proposals in this format?

What are the advantages and disadvantages of requiring pricing information from contractors in this format?

Mr. Michael Boorstein stated that the basic cost of engineering is a key point of the OBO organization. General Williams emphasized that the objective in cost engineering is to break out of the traditional mode and to make certain that OBO will be viewed as the owner. OBO is on a tight timeline for design /build and cannot wait for the translation in the standards to mature.

Mr. John Tato highlighted the adaptation for use in OBO of a new model for cost estimating called Success, that will enhance estimates for the first cost, give the difference in costs, and provide initial and lifecycle costs. The tool thinks like a developer and is useful in decision making.

Panel members discussed advantages and disadvantages of the Uniformat II standard:

Advantages

- For DOS and other group owners who are moving to performance-based procurement in design/build, the gathering of information in Uniformat II is useful in understanding what they are getting.
- Uniformat II is a holistic system approach to categorizing cost. CSI is for materials and components. The two are coming closer together.

Disadvantages

- There are a lot of hidden and regular costs in the transition to Uniformat II, especially to small and medium contractors to transfer from the industry standard to the new ASTM format.
- There is no exterior envelope contractor.
- Few contractors are fluent in its use. It is not a way to build buildings, and there is not a lot of buy-in. OBO needs to understand the work within groups that have overhead to tolerate changing information into costs.
- Contractors need to be given information in a form that is usable.

Panel Comments/Suggestions

OBO should be sensitive about asking a contractor to invest a lot of time when re-doing a system in the new format and tolerant of the way business is being done. If agencies such as DOS provide incentives like training, then firms feel like they are rewarded for using it.

TOPIC 2:

How do owners/developers determine an appropriate amount of contingency space to be factored into new facilities to account for changes in programs and increased future requirements?

Mr. Gay Mount opened the discussion by stating that the problem is that OBO is the builder and not the occupant. OBO builds into the future for groups that have operational requirements and programmatic issues such as AIDS, poverty, and law enforcement. OBO builds contingency into the standard design and modular functioning to make the building flexible for integral points such as the fixed parts, classified and unclassified sections, and parts that deal with the public, like Consular Affairs.

Mr. Boorstein described the legal requirement that all Government functions are to be collocated on the same compound. There are enormous hoops to waiving collocation.

General Williams identified three objectives for space: 1) do what is good for the taxpayer, 2) take a smart approach to building a new building, and 3) get the most out of

its growth issues. Rightsizing and discipline are key. The population may be sound today, but there is the notion of what it will be in future the years.

Several issues impact growth, such as the cost. OBO does not have unlimited funds, and Congress is very specific about size limitations. It is expensive to expand a building, because of the security. OBO can expand horizontally, not vertically, because of the design. Expandability has been built into the design. The problems are resources to do it and prioritization. At some point when developing specifications, OBO will state that the program is closed for the number of U.S. desks and that translates into space. If something else comes along, OBO puts a premium on it.

General Williams described OBO's intensified planning and development approach to space. He indicated that OBO has all of the history and trend information now to develop a standard design that helps design parametrically. OBO has a vehicle to gather all the requirements and a business case to further define the project. This is used for a yes or no decision, before the project moves forward. OBO asks, "Where do we expect the mission at this location to be in 7-10 years?" and gets folks to sign up to that. Planning is done around a set of criteria, and it becomes a disciplined process that OBO lives with in this period of time. A little growth is built in for each category of space, unclassified and classified, that is a percent of the gross square meters.

DOS is planning for its tenants to pay for the space they use in the future. This will be a more orderly, controlled process, especially in the larger facilities. Internal furnishings are paid for by agencies on a cost-shared basis.

DOS has a fungible population. An example is Consular Affairs in China or Russia, where there is a large adoption component. That type of operation is tied to the community and has little to do with operational business. OBO can go to commercial space and eliminate planning for adoption in 2005 for Russia. OBO has introduced this into the policy mindset. It has been done in China.

Capital investments are justified by confirming that clients will stay in a location. OBO can then use the vision of what the client is trying to do at a location and plan for space. This is a straightforward solution for potential growth.

Panel Comments/Suggestions

- Continue to use a holistic approach to funding.
- Apply standards that have been developed, and use them in a modular way.
 - Encourage designs to counter "expansion" in thought. This is tough with security requirements and overlapping site and space problems.
 - Approach standards from a functional perspective by giving clients a range to use as guidelines for space requirements.
- Use a business model to determine what to build. This will help in the design to determine the most effective way to do expansion.

- Enforce the real projected services evaluated for a site or you miss the value of the data for the planning target. Look at the situation, then let space planners do the job. The key is not just the square footage, but also to service demands.
- Show trends and statistics to congress and advise them that consideration of the cost of the infrastructure is part of the thought processes on adding to a building for security.
- Document the concept of technology used in your plan for a site to reduce square footage, such as remote learning or conferencing. This allows OBO to go back and state the prioritization and show how it has accommodated clients through a technological solution in the number of "hot seats" versus number of permanent seats.

TOPIC 3:

When is the program – the number of people, space allocations, and total size of the facility – considered fixed and not subject to significant change?

The Panel responded with answers that ranged from specific, such as "a program is fixed the first day and the very last day," to general answers on how a program is defined. The definition of fixed was discussed as not being so much about changes in the program, but from the standpoint of cost. Members discussed the "accordion"-like relationship of programs and procurement. The Panel agreed that a program is a moving target that must be stated clearly, so that when it changes, it is understood that there is more risk. In design/build, things will change as long as there are requirements.

OBO needs a pool of money that enables it to begin to redefine and renovate, but then continually refine the building, so that they are current. It becomes lifecycle thinking, and the U.S. Government should be able to procure on a lifecycle basis. Draw the line to show when the cost is fixed, not because of change, but because it goes to another budget. For example, if you must add a facility, you should be able to say okay if it is part of the construction now. It is in another part of the budget. OBO has explored with OMB and congress loosening rigidity in FAR requirements to employ a version of that system for best value.

The program depends on whether it is a dedicated, specialized facility or a merchandise facility. We do a construction cost that is a small percentage of product costs for a dedicated facility or a merchant building. Private is better, because all of it is in a mixed bag. This is an issue, because we want to put all of it in one building, and it is specialized and dedicated. Factors that are not cost related drive it. Specialized facilities cost more. When a project is completed, it won't be right, but it can be done on a contingency basis.

Panel Comments/Suggestions

- Use flexibility to build space. Flexibility can be built in by creating spaces that may be in an individual office as "hot spaces," because they are divided.
- Provide a budget, so that you have internal maintenance and management funds. Then you can accommodate over time and that is the tool to transfer to your client.

- Change the procurement model in Government, because it is so restrictive and not flexible. In private industry they recognize and are willing to pay when change occurs. In construction, there is progression. The procurement process with congress is fixed and builds in rigidity.

TOPIC 4:

How can OBO create organizational "buy-in"... from the top to bottom?

OBO has a lot of initiatives, has totally streamlined and re-organized as a performance-based organization, is using performance procurement, and has introduced accountability. General Williams posed a role-playing scenario to the Panel, asking each of them to assume that they have been part of an organization for the last 10 years – external evaluations of the organization have not been good and morale is shot; the organization changes and leadership changes and those saying once it didn't look good are now saying it does look better; each employee has the same pay, is participating in reviews, the job is enriched, and is now connected to out of the box thinking. If they are middle managers how do they feel?

Panel Comments/Suggestions

- Attack from both the top and bottom. Engage middle managers in decisions and policy making as part of the solution and as an incentive to create a better product.
- Educate and market from top to bottom:
 - Build enthusiasm for change. The Government is at a marvelous point, and it is also at a point of crisis, because of the demographics of retirement.
 - Cultural change is real. The multi-discipline approach to bringing architecture, construction, and all aspects of a project together is good.
 - Produce two brochures, one for the inside staff and one for the outside, that markets the OBO philosophy.
- Find a way to incentivize the change process for a short period of time.
 - Identify the work specifically and quantify it.
 - Be careful with programs and change. Along with the evaluation and other Government personnel processes, be sure to get buy in from personnel groups. Expose the risks and rewards of participation, so employees don't get shot down in their IDP.
- Reward people. Find a way to incentivize someone for outstanding work.
 - Give bonuses and authority to carry out the work; do project-related bonuses.
 - Have project managers manage their requests from their own budgets.
 - Encourage team respect.
 - Acknowledge work and successes over time.
 - Provide prestigious rewards such as brass coasters or other non-monetary items for achievement or spectacular performance.
 - Recognize innovative projects outside of OBO, for example announce in AESC.
 - Recognize the team, even if members have migrated to other sites.
- Identify stakeholders and how they will influence your success and what it means for your organization

- Mr. Joel Zingeser recommended to the IAP a book, Who Moved My Cheese, for organizational change issues.
- Teach OBO problems in the ambassador seminars to market and build understanding.

OBO needs praise from users, from Department management, and from Congress.

TOPIC 5:

Database/internet technology: How can we build on the existing POE Database, and make it available at OBO, then with interested parties worldwide for input/or read-only (i.e., Facility Managers, Project Directors, etc.)?

Establish a process to put aside funds for "tweaking" a project upon completion ...following a POE exercise.

How do we create an incentive for contractors (i.e., D/B project) to meet a minimum level of user satisfaction for full payment or to correct the problems?

For OBO, POE begins one and one-half years after the warranty period. All A&E and contractors should be involved. Pre-occupancy is a prelude to the contractor and designer work. It lets them know all that they will need. The OBO Planning group develops the standard questions. There is also a technical review by subject matter experts. The questionnaire asks people at the site if the program does what it is supposed to do or if it does what the person at the site wants it to do. There is a review of the documents, a review of the post in operation, and a discussion after evaluators.

The point of the POE is to improve the product and to make sure that the "original" people are not involved. OBO wants to objectively find out what is being done correctly in the area of design. POE is a limited term because of the process we go through, so we can evaluate a project at the milestones. We want to improve the usability, serviceability, and maintainability.

OBO does major renovations for existing facilities. This presents differences in design issues. For example, Moscow is a re-design and some lessons will be gathered for re-design for new criteria and standards.

Panel Suggestions/Comments

- Make sure that OBO gets what they asked for from the occupant.
- Commissioning and education go hand in hand. Some individuals don't use equipment as designed. They don't read manuals.
- Dictate the process that assures the changes are in and document changes to the system. Owners find that, as we progress, we assume we get the as-built drawings.
- NIBS does work with a focus on the MEP system. Included in this should be training and not just an open door. Train people on what they have – not just the OEM.
- The 18-month evaluation is a good idea.
- Link the POE to the way that OBO does business.

- The owner does his own evaluation when he buys property. When the building is built, he has the renter do an evaluation. Do you do tradeoffs with the money you spent versus what the user sees they got in renting?
- There is flexibility in the post 9-11 environment. The question is how flexible or adaptable the new building is if a new set of requirements are received.
- Document up front when you commission the design. That gives you a baseline. You don't have a reservoir of knowledge to assess and see what worked or didn't that is unbiased.
- The Achilles heel is the criteria set up to determine needs versus wants. You may have a designated group that you use.

At 11:30 a.m., General Williams introduced Deputy Secretary Richard Armitage and Under Secretary Grant Green. The Deputy Secretary told the Panel that Secretary Colin Powell is traveling with President Bush in China, but that he wanted to thank each panel member for their service on the OBO Industry Advisory Panel. The Deputy Secretary noted that the Department has 20,000 employees living and working in 13,000 properties at 260 locations around the world. He emphasized the seriousness of the Panel's work. The Department needs consensus and guidance, and the Panel performs a critical function.

The meeting adjourned for lunch from 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

TOPIC 6: *Rent Surcharge*

Mr. Terry Wilmer explained that the Department of State currently pays the full cost for new office buildings, embassies, and consulates. OBO developed and presented to congress a rent surcharge for agencies and departments receiving benefits overseas, so that they pay full share. The program does not replace the current Capital Program. OBO's approach is to determine a fair price, administer the program in a simple and equitable way, and eliminate politics and space issues. Agencies will pay the rent surcharge annually, based on the number of personnel overseas. About 33,000 people need space, and 85% of the buildings do not meet security. Each agency should pay its fair share. All renters are treated the same. The program will continue year after year, until all employees are in a secure facility.

DOS will collect at the macro level, by agency worldwide. That is the equivalent of rent around the world by region. An agency will pay for the space in a building. This requires concurrence for each building. Planning for a building can be put on hold until an agency gets the amount needed for the rent from their committee.

The surcharge is based on where personnel are currently located. An agency or the Department establishes the program for a total number of people in a fiscal year. If there are fewer people overseas, then an agency pays less. For example, if an agency says now they have 22 people instead of 25, they will pay less. The rent surcharge will drive rightsizing.

DOS will address the facility needs. If the facility is an older building, it has a lot of advantages. Each has a permanent security package developed to a standard. An agency pays a rent surcharge on existing space.

Calculating the Rent Surcharge

The method OBO prefers for the rent surcharge program is a per person cost calculated each year. There is no totally equitable program. DOS could collect by the square foot, by the desk, or by the person. The per person charge makes sense, because it ties to the concept of rightsizing. Local staff (Foreign Service Nationals) is included in the headcount. DOS is the largest single contributor and is charged the same as others. OBO recognizes pricing in five regions. Staffing for most agencies overseas is fairly stable. The charge for a room is the same regardless of its size. The calculation is for the number of people and the square foot dimension for class A on average for the region.

Use of the Term "Rent"

The Panel questioned the use of the term "rent." They suggested that it could be misinterpreted, has political implications, and can be confused with budgetary needs. Mr. Wilmer indicated that the idea was originally called "capital surcharge." The Hill said, "No, you pay rent," so now it is known as rent surcharge. The concept of floating rent was also submitted and rejected. They want it to start now. Panel members stated that headquarters may perceive the surcharge as funding, but the user perceives it as rent. An alternate term, "management and security fee," was suggested that could be paid for on a per person basis.

DOS had preliminary discussions with agencies, and they concur that they don't like GSA's rent method. OBO met with management agencies and asked if they would agree to chip in. They said yes. The program of capital money is done programmatically year after year. OBO has briefed this program to OMB. They said that it is a budget passback. OBO plans to implement a virtual program in FY 2003 and an actual program in FY 2004. It will be included in the budget this summer. OBO wants consistent money, year after year, to ramp up for costs. Congress must approve capital.

Funding

The Department wants to identify a fund, specifically for new office facilities, that agencies will sign up to. What the fund is called is important in Washington. The Department will do a policy system option analysis to identify who would pay and what the costs are. Money may come in part from direct appropriations, in part from the surcharge, and in part from asset management funds. Agencies will want to isolate the program funds and have the funds go to security projects.

Mr. Jürg Hochuli indicated that there is another hurdle to face with the Appropriations Subcommittee. CJS has always funded this. The Agriculture Committee will need to be dealt with.

OBO will be allocated \$800 million, but won't get \$800 million. OBO will get 65% and a surcharge allocation of \$300 million. It is \$1 billion total. The congressional plan shows the embassies that will be constructed. The proposal is to use money from the DOS trust fund for this long-range program. DOS has ten new office buildings in 2002. Congress appropriated eight, but there are "x" dollars in our account that we could use.

Panel Suggestions/Comments

- The money must go into a fund for the construction or rehab of a building.
- Sell me that my guy has access somewhere, because I paid for that region of the world versus I have need of secure protection.
- Declare building obsolescence, then tap funds to replace the building. This falls under different criteria for a new office building.
- You have a formula for the \$8 million: divide the heads by \$8 million and then the argument for building up for markets is more reasonable. Or get a forecast and divide it by the budget.
- You have a program that is \$800 million funded now. Get GSA to go with you as part of your team to defend your budget.
- Adapt a systems approach to cost. You should be able to develop accurate cost to build new office buildings.

DOS has been wrestling with this program for nine months. Cost sharing should be added to the regular requirement. DOS can increase the requirement, but the concept of cost sharing must be in place, straightforward, and documented. There is a high level study from Congress that suggests that DOS look for innovative ways to generate funds to help themselves. A lot of people are not paying their fair share. OBO suggests generating more funds for the Department's capital program by cost sharing. We don't know what will digest on congress' plate, but we know that they will go to businesses and ask if this will work.

Panel Comments/Suggestions

- Don't make any changes. Use the system you are using now.
- Sell the concept around:
 - Get approval before going to OMB. The specific need is to get security enhancements in place. The people who benefit are the agencies, and they pay.
 - Get OMB on board. That drives the Executive Branch, and they can force the line items to show up.
 - Get the White House to buy in.
- Promote the idea that if others are not safe, they will support us and that all agencies are in this together.

The Panel asked why DOS doesn't charge for maintenance. Maintenance is charged by percent of occupancy. It was suggested that if DOS is going to ask for additional charges, that will increase the maintenance charge currently paid by agencies and the agencies will object.

Panel Comments/Suggestions

- It makes more sense to use the money to fix an existing building versus new construction. This way DOS is funded for new construction now and doesn't have to come up with adequate money to fix an existing building that has no security standard. DOS should sell the security standard issue.
- Make sure that space is available. Paying customers expect space.
- Use square feet for the requirement.
- DOS may need to develop a formula for "hot desking."
- Keep it simple by region. You roll up by agency and bill worldwide.
- All agencies should pay their fair share. If you have a special requirement for class A, you pay comparable market share, but not the full share, which is less to acquire in design/ build.
- You should go to a rent structure to make it work. Also, pay the same rate to yourself – whatever it is at capital cost – out of your operational budget.
- Deriving revenues from class A rent doesn't sound right if State gets 82% of the allocation they pay.
- Do not use money in a single fund that has other sources attached. DOS has priority on security issues first and you will get user agencies involved. You want to account for that money.
- The cost of an embassy is greater because of bio-terrorism. So now you increase if you want a constant stream of money.

The Panel agreed on the following:

- OBO's plan makes sense.
- Charging at the macro level makes sense.
- The methods are all within 10-15% of each other.
- It makes sense to either go to one part of the appropriations system and say this is where we are going, or to say that we are going to all.
- The tenant should pay.
- It is a congressional decision on who should be responsible for safety.

TOPIC 7:

How can OBO get more interest and business from the construction community?

Mr. Joseph Toussaint asked the Panel how contracts should be allotted among firms. For example, if there are seven projects worldwide, should one entity get all seven or they are broken up so others get two or three? Panel members explained that the perception is that OBO awards predominately to J.A.Jones. Jones comes in at 85% of the bids. Contractors do not want to invest four or five bid events and the cost to bid when the business is going to Jones.

OBO members explained that last year they met to bid and had the option to go to three contractors. There were six to seven America firms, and all were pre-qualified properly. The bid was opened up and, even with that, it turned out individually that Jones got the award for the same reasons.

General Williams stated that OBO needs to significantly increase its participating pool. That will be better for Government and better for all others. He encouraged firms to come and talk. OBO is not locked in. There is flexibility with the FAR, and OBO wants the capability in place. We now have design/build standards in place and tools. He stated that OBO has massive rehab and renovation work at embassies in northern Europe, because many have dysfunctional systems such as elevators. OBO has possible IQC contracts to use on task orders for small announcements and different types of work. OBO has opened the door wider than ever. There are contracts from \$100,000 to \$100 million for small and medium companies, if they are capable and bonded. The work is all overseas. There is a host of rehab work, such as roofing, mechanical contractor renovations, and security-related, masonry, and fixtures work. The right of passage is a clearance and security requirements. There are no restrictions against small firms. In addition, OBO is doing additional security enhancements on emergency escape hatches that are broken. The work can be broken into small parts.

Panel Comments/Suggestions

- Try to award contracts to firms that have lost bids to OBO in the past.
- Limit the number of awards to two or three for each firm, because there is a huge benefit to bundling, especially with a standard design.
- Avoid giving all jobs to one firm, because if the job goes bad then all projects are at risk.
- Award to the lowest bidder with no more than two awarded to any one firm.
- Require less bonding for a job to get companies to share insurance and manage risk.
- Use Panel members to educate contractors on doing business with OBO.
- Leverage Industry Day to market OBO.
- Develop a program on doing business overseas and promote it.
- Leverage Request for Quote (RFQ) and other methods for design/build, such as standard, cost-oriented billing and best value.
- Encourage an open door to look at construction management procedures for contractors.
- Break work into sub components that are accessible for smaller contractors, but not beyond medium to small contractors.
- Let construction management encourage managers to break work into a manageable size versus bulk, in order to get a larger pool, so you can mentor and get the feel for the work. If the bulk pile is in one pool, you never see those people. This way you minimize the smaller contractors who go to the back door of big firms and contractors.
- Target the 340 associations in construction management for specialized work (i.e. Coalition Council on Mechanical Construction).

CLOSING REMARKS: General Williams thanked the IAP members for their comments and suggestions and expressed appreciation for their response to the charge and the call for the Industry Advisory Panel. He informed the group that the Department tries to be open in speaking about the Government's business and that members will share

in future cost-sharing actions. He requested that IAP members let the Department work with its stakeholders first on these issues, so that it can stay close to the private sector to be credible, to be performance based, and to have accountability.

General Williams advised that the IAP will meet quarterly. In one of the next three or four meetings, Panel members will be asked to bring issues they would like to discuss. OBO hopes that the Panel members will have a good time and gain satisfaction from their participation. General Williams expressed his pleasure to have the IAP members today.

General Charles E. Williams
Designated Federal Official
Chair

FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE

INDUSTRY ADVISORY PANEL ATTENDEES

FEBRUARY 21, 2002

Industry Advisory Panel Members

Harold L. Adams, Chairman, RTKL Associates Inc., representing the American Institute of Architects

Jeffrey L. Beard, President and CEO, Design-Build Institute of America, representing the Design-Build Institute of America

Harvey M. Bernstein, President and CEO, Civil Engineering Research Foundation /International Institute for Energy Conservation, representing the Civil Engineering Research Foundation and International Institute for Energy Conservation

Ida B. Brooker, Manager for Construction and Environmental Contracts, The Boeing Company, representing Women Construction Owners and Executives, U.S.A.

Harvey L. Kornbluh, Chairman and CEO, Construction Consultants International Corporation, representing Associated Owners and Developers

David H. Ready, President, OR Partners, Inc., representing the National Association of Minority Contractors

Thomas J. Rittenhouse III, Principal, Weidlinger Associates, Inc., representing the American Society of Civil Engineers

Derrish M. Wolff, President and CEO, The Louis Berger Group, representing the American Council of Engineering Companies and the Building Futures Council

Joel Zingeser, Director of Corporate Development, Grunley Construction Company, representing The Associated General Contractors of America

U.S. Government – Overseas Buildings Operations

Charles E. Williams, Director /Chief Operating Officer

Suzanne Conrad, Chief of Staff

Michael Boorstein, Managing Director, Planning and Development

Joseph Toussaint, Managing Director, Project Execution

Terry Wilmer, Managing Director, Real Estate and Property Management

Joseph Galla, Director, Information Management

James Robertson, Managing Director, Operations and Maintenance

Jurg Hochuli, Managing Director, Resource Management

Elaine Anderson, Special Assistant, Internal Review

Samuel Bleicher, Special Assistant, Congressional and Business Affairs

Sandra Piech, Special Assistant, Interagency Affairs and Special Projects

Phyllis Patton, Personal Assistant to General Williams

P.K. Bagchi, Director, Construction and Commissioning

Jim Schoonover, Director, Facility Management
Cliff Flowers, Director, Security Management
Gay Mount, Director, Project Planning
Lewellyn Hedgbeth, Director, Area Management
Steve Urman, Director, Safety, Health and Environmental Management
John Tato, Director, Project Evaluation and Analysis
Harry Marinos, Director (acting), Design and Engineering
Bill Miner, Chief, Electrical Support Branch
Antonio Johnson, Information Management Support
Fran Lovata, Information Management Support

Other U.S. Government

Richard Armitage, Deputy Secretary
Grant Green, Under Secretary for Management
Richard Astor, OIG
Howard Goldman, OIG
Jeremiah Perry, USAID, AFGE Representative

Public Participants

John T. Stewart, Vice President Disaster Recovery, Parsons
Julia Brickell, Vice President, Disaster Recovery, Parsons Brinckerhoff
Tina Benedetti, Director of Federal Marketing, Parsons Brinckerhoff